

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

LG DISPLAY CO., LTD.,	
Plaintiff,	
v.	C.A. No. 06-726-JJF
	C.A. No. 07-357-JJF
CHI MEI OPTOELECTRONICS CORPORATION, et al.	CONSOLIDATED CASES
Defendants.	

LG DISPLAY CO., LTD.'S ANSWER TO
CHI MEI OPTOELECTRONICS CORPORATION'S COUNTERCLAIMS TO
THE COMPLAINT OF LG DISPLAY CO., LTD.

LG Display, Co., Ltd. ("LG Display"), by and through its undersigned counsel, hereby files its Answer in Response to Chi Mei Optoelectronics Corporation's Counterclaims to the Complaint of LG Display in the above titled action, filed on May 14, 2008 as D.I. 204.

RESPONSE TO ALLEGATIONS AS TO THE COUNTERCLAIMS

1. The allegations in paragraph 1 of the Counterclaims are conclusions of law to which no response is required.
2. The allegations in paragraph 2 of the Counterclaims are conclusions of law to which no response is required.
3. LG Display admits the allegations of paragraph 3 of the Counterclaims.
4. LG Display denies the allegations of paragraph 4 of the Counterclaims.
5. The allegations in paragraph 5 of the Counterclaims are conclusions of law to which no response is required.

RESPONSE TO ALLEGATIONS AS TO THE PARTIES

6. LG Display admits the allegations of paragraph 6 of the Counterclaims.

7. LG Display admits the allegations of paragraph 7 of the Counterclaims.

RESPONSE TO ALLEGATIONS AS TO JURISDICTION AND VENUE

8. LG Display admits that these Counterclaims are asserted under the Declaratory Judgment Act and the Patent Laws, but denies the remaining allegations of paragraph 8 of the Counterclaims.

9. LG Display admits the allegations of paragraph 9 of the Counterclaims.

10. LG Display admits the allegations of paragraph 10 of the Counterclaims.

11. LG Display admits the allegations of paragraph 11 of the Counterclaims.

RESPONSE TO COUNTERCLAIM COUNT III

12. LG Display refers to and incorporates herein its responses to CMO's allegations in paragraphs 1-11, above, as though fully set forth herein.

13. LG Display denies the allegations in paragraph 13 of the Counterclaims.

14. LG Display denies the allegations in paragraph 14 of the Counterclaims.

RESPONSE TO COUNTERCLAIM COUNT IV

15. LG Display refers to and incorporates herein its responses to CMO's allegations in paragraphs 1-14, above, as though fully set forth herein.

16. LG Display denies the allegations in paragraph 16 of the Counterclaims.

17. LG Display denies the allegations in paragraph 17 of the Counterclaims.

18. LG Display denies the allegations in paragraph 18 of the Counterclaims.

19. LG Display denies the allegations in paragraph 19 of the Counterclaims.

RESPONSE TO UNNUMBERED PARAGRAPH

As to the unnumbered paragraph, including subparagraphs (a) through (e), LG Display denies the allegations contained therein and denies that CMO is entitled to the requested relief.

June 6, 2008

BAYARD, P.A.

/s/ Richard D. Kirk (rk0922)
Richard D. Kirk
Ashley B. Stitzer
222 Delaware Avenue, Suite 900
P.O. Box 25130
Wilmington, DE 19899-5130
rkirk@bayardfirm.com
(302) 655-5000

Counsel for Plaintiff
LG DISPLAY CO., LTD
LG DISPLAY AMERICA, INC.

OF COUNSEL:

Gaspare J. Bono
R. Tyler Goodwyn
Lora A. Brzezynski
McKenna Long & Aldridge LLP
1900 K Street, NW
Washington, DC 20006
202-496-7500

{01027384;v1}

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned counsel certifies that, on June 6, 2008, he served the foregoing documents by email and by hand upon the following counsel:

Philip A. Rovner
David E. Moore
POTTER ANDERSON & CORROON LLP
1313 North Market Street
Wilmington, DE 19899-0951

Karen L. Pascale
John W. Shaw
YOUNG CONAWAY STARGATT &
TAYLOR, LLP
The Brandywine Building
1000 West Street, 17th Floor
Wilmington, DE 19899-0391

The undersigned counsel further certifies that, on June 6, 2008, he served the foregoing documents by email and by U.S. Mail upon the following counsel:

Jonathan S. Kagan
IRELL & MANELLA LLP
1800 Avenue of the Stars
Suite 900
Los Angeles, CA 90067

Vincent K. Yip
Peter J. Wied
PAUL, HASTINGS, JANOFSKY &
WALKER LLP
515 South Flower Street, 25th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90071

Ron E. Shulman, Esquire
Julie Holloway, Esquire
WILSON SONSINI GOODRICH & ROSATI
650 Page Mill Road
Palo Alto, California 94304-1050

M. Craig Tyler, Esquire
Brian D. Range, Esquire
WILSON SONSINI GOODRICH & ROSATI
8911 Capital of Texas Highway North
Westech 360, Suite 3350
Austin, Texas 78759-8497

/s/ Richard D. Kirk, (rk0922)
Richard D. Kirk

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

LG DISPLAY CO., LTD.,	
Plaintiff,	
v.	C.A. No. 06-726-JJF
	C.A. No. 07-357-JJF
CHI MEI OPTOELECTRONICS CORPORATION, et al.	CONSOLIDATED CASES
Defendants.	

LG DISPLAY CO., LTD.'S ANSWER TO
CHI MEI OPTOELECTRONICS CORPORATION'S COUNTERCLAIMS TO
THE COUNTERCLAIMS OF LG DISPLAY CO., LTD.

LG Display, Co., Ltd. ("LG Display"), by and through its undersigned counsel, hereby files its Answer in Response to Chi Mei Optoelectronics Corporation's Counterclaims to the Counterclaims of LG Display in the above titled action, filed on May 14, 2008 as D.I. 205.

RESPONSE TO ALLEGATIONS AS TO THE COUNTERCLAIMS

1. The allegations in paragraph 1 of the Counterclaims are conclusions of law to which no response is required.
2. The allegations in paragraph 2 of the Counterclaims are conclusions of law to which no response is required.
3. LG Display admits the allegations of paragraph 3 of the Counterclaims.
4. LG Display denies the allegations of paragraph 4 of the Counterclaims.
5. The allegations in paragraph 5 of the Counterclaims are conclusions of law to which no response is required.

RESPONSE TO ALLEGATIONS AS TO THE PARTIES

6. LG Display admits the allegations of paragraph 6 of the Counterclaims.
7. LG Display admits the allegations of paragraph 7 of the Counterclaims.

RESPONSE TO ALLEGATIONS AS TO JURISDICTION AND VENUE

8. LG Display admits that these Counterclaims are asserted under the Declaratory Judgment Act and the Patent Laws, but denies the remaining allegations of paragraph 8 of the Counterclaims.

9. LG Display admits the allegations of paragraph 9 of the Counterclaims.
10. LG Display admits the allegations of paragraph 10 of the Counterclaims.
11. LG Display admits the allegations of paragraph 11 of the Counterclaims.

RESPONSE TO COUNTERCLAIM COUNT I

12. LG Display refers to and incorporates herein its responses to CMO's allegations in paragraphs 1-11, above, as though fully set forth herein.
13. LG Display denies the allegations in paragraph 13 of the Counterclaims.
14. LG Display denies the allegations in paragraph 14 of the Counterclaims.

RESPONSE TO COUNTERCLAIM COUNT II

15. LG Display refers to and incorporates herein its responses to CMO's allegations in paragraphs 1-14, above, as though fully set forth herein.
16. LG Display denies the allegations in paragraph 16 of the Counterclaims.
17. LG Display denies the allegations in paragraph 17 of the Counterclaims.
18. LG Display denies the allegations in paragraph 18 of the Counterclaims.
19. LG Display denies the allegations in paragraph 19 of the Counterclaims.

RESPONSE TO UNNUMBERED PARAGRAPH

As to the unnumbered paragraph, including subparagraphs (a) through (e), LG Display denies the allegations contained therein and denies that CMO is entitled to the requested relief.

June 6, 2008

BAYARD, P.A.

/s/ Richard D. Kirk (rk0922)

Richard D. Kirk

Ashley B. Stitzer

222 Delaware Avenue, Suite 900

P.O. Box 25130

Wilmington, DE 19899-5130

rkirk@bayardfirm.com

(302) 655-5000

Counsel for Plaintiff

LG DISPLAY CO., LTD

LG DISPLAY AMERICA, INC.

OF COUNSEL:

Gaspare J. Bono

R. Tyler Goodwyn

Lora A. Brzezynski

McKenna Long & Aldridge LLP

1900 K Street, NW

Washington, DC 20006

202-496-7500

{01027386;v1}